

REMARKS

Further consideration of this application courteously is solicited.

Initially, Applicants and the undersigned are grateful to the Examiner for participating in the interview of May 6, 2005. The interview is believed to have been very beneficial in advancing the prosecution of this application. As a result of the interview, claims 22, 26 and 28 have been cancelled, claims 1, 7 and 14 amended, and claim 32 added. Claims 9, 19-21, 30 and 31 are inactive. The following will address the issues raised in the February 25, 2005 Office Action, as well as reflect on the discussions during the May 6, 2005 interview.

Early on in the February 25, 2005 Office Action, a rejection of claims 1, 2, 5-8, 10, 11, 14 and 22-29 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, is expressed. The rejection is based upon the contention that the original disclosure fails to set forth ranges as defined in claims 1 and 14, in the manner that such claims were amended on August 23, 2004. This rejection was resolved during the interview. It was agreed that the original disclosure adequately supports the ranges as set forth in previously-amended claims 1 and 14. Actually, this rejection has been made moot with respect to claim 1 by this Amendment because the temperature recitations have been moved from claim 1 to claim 14 (now converted to dependent form), and newly-added dependent claim 32. In any event, the molding temperature recitations, and the mold releasing temperature ranges stated in dependent claims 14 and 32, as agreed during the interview, fully are supported by Table 1 on page 13 of Applicants' disclosure. In view of the foregoing, it courteously is urged that the rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, has been overcome. Formal withdrawal of this rejection now is courteously solicited.


Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 19, 11, 14 and 22-29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as purportedly obvious over U.S. Patent 5,427,599 to Greschner, et al. (Greschner). The interview also covered this rejection. Likewise, agreement was reached to the effect that the rejection is traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended in accordance with the discussion with the Examiner. As amended, claim 1 specifies the Applicants' micro-shape transcription method as "for producing an optical waveguide or a diffraction grating from thermoplastic resin". The thermoplastic resin is introduced as the "base material" thereafter recited in claim 1. Also, as the Examiner suggested, equations (1) and (2) setting forth requirements for (i) pressing and separating temperatures, (ii) mold and base material thermal expansion coefficients, and (iii) the maximum distance between the transcription center of the transcription face and the concave or convex pattern, in order to time mold separation, have been restored to claim 1. It was understood from the interview that these recitations would clearly distinguish the claim over Greschner, which teaches, to those of ordinary skill in the art, stamping guide track structures into the glass substrate of an optical disk. For these reasons, Applicants now respectfully submit that the sole rejection based upon prior art now has been overcome formally. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection likewise courteously are solicited.

In view of the foregoing amendments and Remarks, it is courteously urged that all of the active claims are allowable, and that this application therefore is in condition for allowance. Favorable action in this regard earnestly is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP



Michael A. Makuch, Reg. 32,263
1850 M Street, NW – Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036
Telephone : 202/263-4300
Facsimile : 202/263-4329

Date: May 20, 2005

233285